UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/579,414	05/15/2006	Johannes Henricus Maria Korst	NL 031325	8169	
	7590 01/09/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 3001			MCCORD, PAUL C		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2614			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			01/09/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/579,414	KORST ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
PAUL MCCORD	2614		

	PAUL MCCORD	2614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOī v);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.124. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	l6 and 41.33(a)).		PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		•	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 6-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/CURTIS KUNTZ/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614	/Paul McCord/ Examiner, Art Unit 2614		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments further narrow the relevant claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the arguemtns are not persuasive Applicant maintains that there is no reason to combine the Cliff reference with the Zamir and Kosmi references. Examiner respectfully disarees; both the applicant and the Cliff reference are concerned with the presentation of media that most appeals to a plurality fo users while suppressing the presentation of media which the same users dislike. The Cliff system and method monitors user reactions to the performance of media through the depression of like and dislike buttons in such a way as to allow the Cliff system to better predict user response to a composed song. A composition of a performance of media substantially similar to the creation of a playlist: both arrange pieces or sections of music to be played into a harmonious whole. The Combination of Cliff with Zamir and Cosmi makes obvious a method of predictive playback that responds to two buttons or optionally a multi-state button where indication of disapproval toword playback of certain media decreases the liklihood of delivery of the disliked and similar media, while an indication of approval increases the liklihood of delivery of the liked and similar media. Zamir section [0019] discloses at least two operational modes of his system from which it would be obvious to include in the first operational modes only songs explicitly liked by the user while the second operational mode allowed for songs not expressly liked so long as they had a probabitlity of being liked i.e. were not explicitly disliked. Thus combined the references teach a method for composing a song, performance or media stream wehrein a user can select a mode wherein liked music is presented or a mode wherein disliked music is not presented, thus the arguments are not persuasive.